MINUTES OF MEETING OF COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN NEW YORK CITY, JULY 23, 1930.

The second meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1931 was held at the office of McKim, Mead and White, 101 Park Avenue, New York City, on Wednesday, July 23, 1930.

The following members were present:

Mr. Moore, Chairman,
Mr. Morris,
Mr. Vitale,
Mr. Winter,
Mr. Cross,
Mr. Weinman,
also Mr. H. P. Caemmerer,

Executive Secretary and Administrative Officer.

There were also present Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d, Executive and Disbursing Officer, National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Major G. H. Gillette, Assistant, and Mr. John F. Nagel of the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission, also Mr. William Mitchell Kendall of the firm of McKim, Mead and White, Architects, and Mr. James E. Fraser and Mr. Leo Friedlander, sculptors for the Arlington Memorial Bridge.

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 o'clock, daylight saving time.

1. ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE:

1. Lamp Posts. Mr. Kendall submitted a design for the lamp posts on the Arlington Memorial Bridge, to be 15' high from the curb with two on each arch as shown in the original design of the bridge. They will be 110' on center in pairs and there will be 140 such lamp posts on the bridge.

In design the lamp post is similar to the single light lamp post approved by the Commission of Fine Arts for the streets of Washington.

The design was approved with a recommendation that a plaster cast be made and set up on the bridge for inspection. As to the lamp posts for Columbia Island Plaza, it was thought that the double light lamp post, larger in size and higher would be preferable.

b. Fenders for the Draw Span. Mr. Kendall protested against the fenders proposed for the draw span, which Col. Grant stated are required by the navigation authorities of the District of Columbia in compliance with law. They must be 8' above high water with a view to protecting both boats and draw span. Mr. Kendall suggested some other device, as posts and chains. This was discussed. Attention was called to Chicago bridges having a draw span without fenders but it was noted this draw span extends across the river without there being separate arches in the bridge. He also called attention to the treatment of the draw span at the Panama Canal.

Col. Grant called attention to the fact that there is not enough mud to assure a safe placing of the posts in the river and that according to the law, they would still have to project 8' above high water. He regarded it very important to have adequate protection for the draw span as it represents one of the most costly items of the bridge--about $900,000. The Commission expressed their regret that there should have to be a draw span in the bridge as did also Mr. Kendall, but Col. Grant said the navigation authorities have required it and the plans have been developed accordingly. Mr. Moore said the amount of traffic coming up the Potomac to Georgetown does not justify a draw span and he was sorry it ever had to become a part of the bridge.

Col. Grant offered to take up the question of a modified form of fender with the War Department and it was agreed that he and Mr. Kendall consider the matter further with the War Department authorities. Mr. Moore said in

behalf of the Commission he would agree to such modified design as may be decided upon. The Commission disapproved the plan submitted. (Exhibit A) (See also A-1)

c. Sculpture for the Arlington Memorial Bridge. Mr. Fraser and Mr. Friedlander considered with the Commission sculpture proposed for the Arlington Memorial Bridge. Major Gillette called attention to Mr. Fraser's bid of $134,000, including granite, for his two figures at the entrance to the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway and to Mr. Friedlander's bid of $138,000 without the granite, for the two figures at the entrance to the memorial bridge near the Lincoln Memorial. Mr. Fraser said he felt his estimate was as low as he could make it, which would be $67,000 for each figure. Mr. Weinman agreed that this was reasonable. Mr. Friedlander said his estimate was higher doubtless because of the estimates received by him from certain stone men and also estimates from the carver. On the whole, comparing the two estimates, Mr. Friedlander said his was only $14,000 more than Mr. Fraser's as $10,000 was estimated for the granite. Major Gillette said that it is doubtful if the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission could furnish the granite for any lower figure; nevertheless, the Commission felt that in view of the fact that each of these four figures will be practically of the same size (16' high) the price for each figure should be about the same and further efforts should be made by Mr. Friedlander to have his bid reduced.

Mr. Weinman thereupon called attention to the item of carving, saying that this is a very important item although an excellent carver may do the work at a low figure and one not so good may charge a very high price. Mr. Fraser said he has in mind for his work just such a man that is an expert carver, living in Chicago, who will do the work at a low figure. Mr. Friedlander said that the carver he had in mind is not a "low priced man"

and that, therefore, doubtless he could make some adjustment as to this item in his bid.

The Commission after further consideration agreed that Col. Grant ask for authority from the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission to secure an allotment of $134,000 for each of the two sculptural groups at the Lincoln Memorial end of the bridge and the entrance to the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway.

Mr. Weinman suggested that Mr. Friedlander have the carving done by the same man that will do Mr. Fraser's carving as it is understood that the carver will set up his outfit on the grounds near the Memorial and do his work there. Mr. Friedlander expressed himself in favor of this arrangement. Mr. Fraser said that he proposes to make one-half size or 8' models for working models. It is understood that the sculptor will be required simply to furnish an 8" or 10" plinth on which his statue will rest.

d. Columns for Columbia Island Plaza. Mr. Kendall submitted a design for the two columns to be erected on Columbia Island Plaza, which will be 181' high and lighted at the top. The design showed a band of sculptural relief of full sized figures at the base of the column. Mr. Morris objected to this strongly, saying that it resembled too much the French Third Empire style and he felt it would be criticized by the architects of the country to be allowed on these columns. After discussion, the Commission concurred in this and agreed that the columns should be fluted, omitting the sculptural relief at the base and that the whole column should be restudied in relation to the ornamentation at the top of the column, taking into consideration also the smaller bands shown in the design. Attention was called to the designs

of 181' columns designed by McKim, Mead and White for the San Francisco Fair, which were admired. The revised design will be submitted.

2. TOMB OF THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER: Brigadier General L. H. Bash, Chief of the Construction Division, Office of the Quartermaster General, in company with Mr. Lorimer Rich, Architect, and Mr. Tom Jones, Sculptor, submitted a revised study for the treatment of the approach to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington National Cemetery. In explaining the design he said he had shortened the approach 54' and had restudied the parking space to be provided on each side of the approach as it would be hidden when looking eastward from the tomb. Also, he had reduced the width of the steps to 100' and reduced the area of the plaza immediately at the foot of the steps.

Mr. Vitale gave the design special attention and objected strongly to the scheme showing the shortening of the approach. Mr. Vitale regarded it of vital importance that the design be treated adequately from the standpoint of the landscape architect. Mr. Rich said the area was restricted in view of the fact that there are graves at the east end of the approach. Mr. Vitale advised that regardless of the existing graves, the scheme should be studied in relation to a vista that would extend eastward to the Potomac even though the entire scheme could not be carried out immediately. This was pointed out in a letter from the Commission to the Quartermaster General as a result of the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts on July 1.

General Bash thereupon called attention to a conference Mr. Moore had with the Quartermaster General, Major General DeWitt, on Saturday morning, July 19, saying:

"Mr. Moore came down last Saturday to talk with the Quartermaster General about this matter and had a free conference with him. General DeWitt told him and it is undoubtedly a fact that we of the Quartermaster General's Office

sympathize with the Commission of Fine Arts in their desire to develop Arlington National Cemetery according to a plan in which the landscape plan for the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier is made a particular feature. At the present time, however, there are graves immediately to the east of the approach of the Tomb and from the standpoint of the cemetery authorities, it is inadvisable to move these graves at the present time, and it was thought that this part of the design should be so arranged that we would not have to bring up at this time the question of moving the graves. We are very desirous of having a plan approved that will make it possible for the construction work to proceed. The parking should, of course, be arranged so that the automobiles will be out of sight in looking eastward from the tomb."

Mr. Moore called attention to the fact that according to an Act of Congress, no grave should be allowed within 200' of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

Mr. Vitale said the scheme designed by Mr. Rich seemed to him like butchering the original landscape plan for the tomb. Mr. Vitale strongly urged a restudy of this original design, keeping it the former length, that is, restoring the 54'.

On the recommendation of Mr. Vitale, the Commission decided that Mr. Rich should make a new study of the approach along the lines of the original landscape plan, giving the approach an appropriate width in relation to the amphitheatre. The Commission felt that the steps need be no wider than the width of the pavilion of the amphitheatre and urged that the axis be extended as far as the graves will allow so as to bring the study of the construction plan to be carried out now eastward from the tomb at least down to a roadway and that the vista to the Potomac be taken into consideration in a more comprehensive plan.

Mr. Rich said he would have the revised study completed in about two weeks and it was agreed that Mr. Vitale, Mr. Morris, and Mr. Cross could act on it in behalf of the Commission.

Mr. Weinman stated he had talked with Mr. Jones about certain matters of detail with regard to the sculpture on his model of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

3. ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL ARCH: The following letter was received from the Forest Service, dated July 22, 1930, with a plan for the Roosevelt Memorial Arch and a description of the plan (Exhibit B), submitted by the architects; also an alternate plan for memorial pillars:

Dear Mr. Caemmerer:

"I am sending you under separate cover two sketches received from Kimball, Steele & Sandham, 836 World-Herald Building, Omaha, Nebraska, which they prepared for the Roosevelt Memorial Archway. I am also inclosing a copy of their letter. Please note that the one design will exceed the amount appropriated by Congress. It is not expected that more funds are to be asked for; possibly if this plan is approved, additional funds might be secured from the Roosevelt Memorial Association.

"The other provides for two pillars, which would not fulfill the definition for archway--the latter word being used in the bill. If you approve either one of these two, no doubt, a joint resolution at the next convening of Congress would permit proceeding with the construction.

"On account of the short time available for completing this work, I do not believe that it can be accomplished during the present calendar year according to the law. Possibly only the corner stone should be laid at the time the President is in Montana and the construction started this fall and completed next year. This, of course, will require a joint resolution in Congress to permit the expenditure of this money the next calendar year.

"If you do not approve either design, possibly suggestions from you to be transmitted to the architects would be in line.

"We would greatly appreciate it if you would take some action at the meeting which you are now holding. If you will call me up on your return, I shall be glad to come over to your office."

(Signed) G. H. Lautz
United States Forest Service.

The Commission inspected the two designs submitted and regarded neither of them satisfactory. It was noted also that the amount appropriated by Congress of $25,000 was inadequate for an arch. Mr. Vitale regarded it inappropriate to erect an arch at the site proposed. The idea of a memorial gateway as suggeated by the two pillars shown in one of the designs seemed agreeable to the Commission. However, before making a further design, Mr. Vitale urged in behalf of the Commission that a comprehensive set of photographs be secured of the particular location so that the type of design could be more properly determined.

The Commission disapproved the designs submitted. The Commission concurred in the suggestion of the Forest Service that for the celebration this fall, simply the cornerstone be laid. This memorial will be built on the Continental Divide at Marias Pass at the edge of a large forest reserve and joining Glacier National Park (Exhibit C). Seealso C-1.

4. ROCK CREEK PARKWAY: Col. Grant submitted the following letter, dated July 21, 1930, with sketch for the proposed purchase of a tract of land at the intersection of Connecticut Avenue and Calvert Street for the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway:

My dear Mr. Moore:

"In accordance with the Act of Congress approved March 2, 1929, your Commission's approval is requested of the addition to the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway, lots 12, 813 and 815 in Square 2202. This property, as shown on the accompanying print, is situated within the triangle formed by Connecticut Avenue and Calvert Street, which has recently been zoned commercial.

"The addition of this property to the Parkway would protect the approaches to the Connecticut Avenue and Calvert Street bridges and would, in my opinion, be a most desirable addition to the Parkway in that it would secure this triangle from a commercial development, which would be entirely incongruous with the parkway development."

Very truly yours,
(Signed) U. S. Grant 3d,
Executive and Disbursing Officer.

Col. Grant said that the cost of this tract will be about $250,000 but he regarded it of vital importance to purchase the land to give proper protection to the parkway at this location. The Commission approved the recommendation that the tract of land be purchased. (Exhibit D)

5. UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT BUILDING: Col. Grant submitted a blueprint, showing the relative size of the United States Supreme Court Building, with the Capitol. The design he said had been prepared by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and he had been asked to bring it to the attention of the Commission of Fine Arts. The Commission noted the great difference in height between the United States Capitol and the facade of the United States Supreme Court Building, but also called attention to the fact that the Library of Congress is not in proper relation architecturally with the United States Capitol; that in this instance the design for the United States Supreme Court Building has been more carefully studied by Mr. Gilbert, and in view of the fact that the design has been approved, appropriations made for it and contracts entered into for construction of the building, nothing further could be done in the matter. At the same time, the Commission did not feel that the United States Supreme Court Building plan will be so out of harmony with the Capitol or the Library of Congress as is felt by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

6. SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT PLANS:

a. The secretary submitted designs received for Liggett's drug store, who desire to occupy the first floor of the building at 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, which is being altered for this purpose.

Mr. Walter T. Williams, architect of Liggett's Drug Store Company, appeared before the Commission, briefly stating that the project of the

company is under way and submitting a letter on the subject (Exhibit E). In view of the fact that they are paying a considerable amount of rent, Mr. Williams said that they would like to occupy the building just as soon as possible.

Mr. Moore said the question before the Commission is whether the show windows shall be allowed at this end of Pennsylvania Avenue as they will certainly not improve the appearance of the Avenue as contemplated by the Shipstead-Luce Act. Attention was called to the improved appearance of the new Shoreham Building at 15th and H Streets and Garfinckel's new store at 14th and G Streets, which have been built without extended show windows. Col. Grant said the privilege of allowing extension of show windows on sidewalks, which are government property, a distance of 4' is being abused and it would doubtless be in the interest of good design if the Commission of Fine Arts would recommend to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia that they be not permitted even though under the existing building regulations the Liggett Company might be entitled to them.

Col. Grant called attention to a store built at the intersection of Connecticut Avenue and New Hampshire Avenue recently, where 60 per cent of the floor area is on government property through such show window extensions. Also there are instances in the city where the show window extension has been allowed to extend higher than one story. The practise of show window extensions has grown out of the old bay window style of building of former days.

Two other designs, one for 1737 Pennsylvania Avenue and 2801 Pennsylvania Avenue similarly involved rebuilding of the store with extension of show windows.

The Commission after consideration had no criticism to offer as to these three sets of designs, with the exception that the show windows should not be allowed, if this could be done, in the interest of improving Pennsylvania Avenue. The Commission recommended that this question of show window extensions be taken up with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia with a view to coming to an agreement with them on the subject (Exhibit E-1)

7. WILLIAM RUFUS KING MEMORIAL: Under date of July 15, 1930, Brigadier General L. H. Bash submitted the following letter, with design, for the William Rufus King Memorial, designed by Karl Gruppe, sculptor:

> My dear Mr. Moore:
>
> "You will recall that at the suggestion of the Commission, and pursuant to authority of Congress, we selected Mr. Karl Gruppe, sculptor, to design a monument in honor of William Rufus King, at Clinton, N. C. Mr. Gruppe has submitted a sketch of the monument and location, and we are ready to proceed immediately to sign the contract, providing the sketch meets with the approval of your Commission.
>
> "May I ask the Commission to act on this sketch at its prospective meeting on or about July 21st, so that the work may proceed without delay.
>
> "For the Quartermaster General:"
>
> Very truly yours,
> (Signed) L. H. Bash,
> Brigadier General, Q.M.C.
> Assistant.

The design was brought to the attention of Mr. Weinman, who said that Mr. Gruppe had called on him at his studio about the matter and submitted a plaster model, which was regarded satisfactory. The design submitted is in accordance with it and the location agreed upon appropriate for it. Upon the recommendation of Mr. Weinman, the Commission approved the design. (Exhibit F)

8. MARINE CORPS EXPEDITIONARY MEDAL: Brigadier General Hugh Matthews of the Marine Corps and Mr. Walker Hancock, Sculptor, appeared before the Commission

with designs for the Expeditionary Medal of the Marine Corps. Mr. Weinman gave the sketches particular attention. General Matthews strongly urged the acceptance of the design heretofore submitted by Mr. Hancock, showing a Marine in uniform and in action. This design seemed to be unsatisfactory to the Commission since it represents a Marine as being aggressive. General Matthews said the Marines are indoctrinated on this point, that they do not seek war but are there for action when fighting becomes necessary. The design showed the Marine in full uniform. The alternative sketches offered by Mr. Hancock showed a Marine at rest, standing at the edge of a boat, with a warship on one side of the Marine and a transport on the other, symbolic of the Navy.

General Matthews said that the staff of the Marine Corps and many of the soldiers who had heard of this original design strongly favor its adoption. Thereupon each of the members of the Commission was asked to state his preference and the majority of the members favored the original sketch. It was then approved, with the suggestion of omitting the warship and transport since as Mr. Weinman stated, the Navy Department is represented on the reverse of the medal by the design of eagle and anchor. (Exhibit G) General Matthews expressed his grateful appreciation of this action of the Commission.

9. SECOND DIVISION MEMORIAL: Under date of July 21, 1930, the following letter was received from General Harbord, Chairman of the Second Division War Memorial Committee, as to designs for their memorial:

Dear Chairman Moore:

"I was very glad to get your letter of July 19th.

"I appreciate your kind words about my little speech at the Belleau Wood dedication and you made the right inference as to my reluctance to sanction a violation of courtesy and good taste."

"The amount which we had in mind for the Second Division Memorial is $150,000. The last convention of the Second Division Association appointed a Committee, which consists of General Lejeune, General Brown, Colonel Hanford MacNider, Captain Mattfeldt and myself, to deal not only with your Commission but with the whole question of raising the money, etc.

"It seems to me that what you have done in permitting Mr. Fraser to submit a sketch and calling on Mr. Keck and Mr. Sanford to do the same is right in line with your original plan of the selection of a sculptor. We shall have not only the pictures they submitted of executed work but we will have these three designs which ought to give us even a better line on the one to whom we should finally like to give the order.

"There was enough politics in the Second Division Association in naming this Memorial Committee so that I should like very much if you could see your way to let as many of our Committee meet with you to formalize the selection of a sculptor. I see nothing in that to interfere with your meeting, which has already been announced, in New York, in which you could carry out your intention of considering designs presented by Keck and Sanford.

"The only thing it would involve would be that you delay any decision about the matter until we could meet with you, probably before the middle of August, in Washington, and then talk over the matter not only of the sculptor but of the adequacy of his particular design for our purpose. We very much appreciate your desire to have us given an adequate design which, at the same time, would be one of the adornments of Washington and, of course, I am more than anxious that the sculptors who have taken an interest in the matter shall have no feeling that they have not been treated fairly.

"If this meets your view, then I will undertake to ascertain just what time around the middle of August I can get General Lejeune and Colonel MacNider to Washington where General Brown and Captain Mattfeldt already are, and I will then communicate with you and ask your pleasure in the matter.

"Many thanks for your kind letter."

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) J. G. Harbord.

Mr. Keck submitted a model (scale one inch to a foot), showing a figure of Victory emerging from a shaft. This memorial will be 40' high. Mr. Keck explained his design to the Commission with great emphasis and enthusiasm. He said it represents only an idea which he had only four or five days to work out.

The Commission expressed their interest in the design and it will be considered by the Commission at a subsequent meeting when the question

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
OF THE
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

August 12, 1930.

MEMORANDUM FOR Mr. Moore:

Under date of August 8, 1930, I received the following letter from Mr. Morris:

> "In the minutes of the meeting of the Fine Arts Commission, held July 23rd, paragraph #9, with reference to the Second Division Memorial, it does not appear to me that the question asked by Mr. Keck on Page 14 is completely answered. To me a new point of view was brought out on that occasion which seems to be important, namely that his design of the eagle and the cock surmounting the sphere, might be objected to on the ground that it too strongly indicated the relationships between France and the United States in the War and, as a corollary, belittled the relationships of the United States with the other Allies."

The minutes will be amended to include this point.

H. R. Lammer

Secretary.

of selecting a sculptor is to be taken up with General Harbord and his Committee.

Also, Mr. Sanford submitted a sketch, which the Commission inspected, showing a figure of Victory on a circular pedestal that is to serve as a memorial room. Mr. Sanford gave the following description of his design:

> "In view of the limited time allowed for the preparation of this sketch (General Harbord's letter to me was dated July 10th and received on July 14th), it was impossible to properly develop a serious sketch of the allegorical figure surmounting the Memorial. Hence, this non-commital presentation of the figure is scarcely more than an indication of its size.
>
> "This statue, symbolizing Victory, should be extremely simple, majestic and powerful in its repose. The most satisfactory medium would be granite, although bronze would also be suitable. The size of the finished figure would measure from 25 to 30 feet, thus giving an approximate height to the entire monument of 50 feet. The pedestal, of extreme simplicity, bears an inscription indicating the purpose of the Memorial. This pedestal is intended to serve as a repository for the safe keeping of the Archives of the Division, battle flags, decorations, etc. The interior walls may carry bronze placques bearing the names of those who gave their lives, names of the commanding officers and those decorated for especial distinction. The door to the vault would be of pierced bronze, utilizing a design combining the sheathed sword and laurel. In effect, the Memorial might serve as a Shrine for pilgrimage for the descendants of the members of the Division.
>
> "This sketch was made with the understanding from General Harbord that no site had been assigned for the Memorial, except that it was to be placed in Washington, D. C.
>
> "Tentative estimates have been taken from competent contractors covering the work involved, and the monument may safely be undertaken in granite for the proposed sum of $150,000."

Mr. Fraser's scheme is that of the flaming sword, which was considered by the Commission at the meeting on July 1 and regarded as an appropriate design for this memorial.

Mr. Keck asked in particular why his design showing an eagle and cock, which he said he had remodeled to make them smaller, in view of the criticism that has come to him that the eagle seemed to be slipping off the globe, had been disapproved. Mr. Weinman said the motive of the eagle and cock was

carefully considered by the Commission and disapproved because the design appeared out of scale. Whether a revised model showing these modifications will be acceptable to the Commission of Fine Arts he could not say. There is also the question of cost to be considered and the location, which has not as yet been agreed upon. Also there is the particular question raised whether such a memorial with these modifications, symbolizing the United States and France, and the cock with a broken wing, would be appropriate for a memorial in the National Capital. Mr. Keck said the United States helped France in the World War and did not go to England, Belgium, or any other country and he has been given assurance that if given three months, he could get the consent of the French authorities for this design. Mr. Moore felt that even though the French government might not object to it, there would still have to be an Act of Congress to allow the erection of it on public grounds in Washington.

Mr. Keck agreed to submit photographs of his revised models and to await the decision of the Commission of Fine Arts in the matter.

General Harbord was advised that in accordance with his desire, no action was taken as to the selection of a sculptor at this meeting and that the Commission would be pleased to consider this with his Committee at some convenient time in the near future. (Exhibit H)

10. MEMORIAL TO GENERAL AYCOCK: Mr. Moore brought to the attention of the Commission a request from Honorable Josephus Daniels of Raleigh, North Carolina, regarding a memorial to General Aycock to be placed in Statuary Hall. The letter from Mr. Daniels is dated June 11, 1930, and reads as follows:

> My dear Mr. Moore:
>
> "The Committee appointed to put a statue of the late Governor Aycock, of North Carolina, in Statuary Hall, wishes to have a meeting shortly. You will recall that we talked to you about it last year. Could you give us the names of the best four or five sculptors?

"What do you think of F. Wm. Sievers whose statue of Maury was recently unveiled in Richmond?"

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) Josephus Daniels.

Mr. Weinman had recommended Messrs. O'Connor, Tefft, Keck, Hering, and Miller, any one of whom would produce a work of art. As to Mr. Sievers, mentioned by Mr. Daniels, the members of the Commission said they were not acquainted with his work. Mr. Weinman stated that he simply knows of Mr. Sievers as one of the sculptors in Richmond. Mr. Daniels was informed accordingly. (Exhibit I)

11. FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL PLANS: Under date of July 21, 1930, the following letter was received from James Berrall, architect of the Freedmen's hospital extension:

Gentlemen:

"By direction of the Secretary of the Interior, I submit herewith for your approval the plans for the proposed maternity ward wing addition to the Freedmen's Hospital buildings, at Fourth and Bryant Streets, N. W., Washington, D. C.

"The elevations of the maternity wing follow the design of the present construction, built in 1907. In plan the new wing is 6'4" wider and 5'0" longer than the adjoining wing. This was done so as to provide the space required by the Surgeon in Chief, Freedmen's Hospital.

"The materials of construction are, Frederick common brick facing, laid in running bond, backed with common brick. The water table, sills, key blocks, cornice and coping are of ornamental terra-cotta, (buff). The roof is of tin. The floor construction is of reinforced concrete, the roof is of precast gypsum slabs laid on structural steel trusses. The partitions are of brick and hollow tile. The floor finish will be terrazzo, tile and cement. Walls and ceilings of plaster. Wood doors and windows, except fire doors and delivery room windows."

Respectfully,
(Signed) James Berrall,
Architect.

Mr. Cross inspected the plans and noted that the proposed addition conforms to the existing building in its style of architecture. Mr. Cross approved the plans and the Commission concurred in the matter. (Exhibit J)

12. MOSAICS FOR THE MOODY-CURRIER GALLERY: Mr. Salvatore Lascari brought to the attention of the Commission of Fine Arts a complaint that he is required to pay $1,500 duty on mosaics because of a ruling of the Court of Customs Appeals in 1927, whereas in 1925, he was allowed to place similar mosaics in Saint Matthews Church, Washington, without the payment of duty. Mr. Lascari said he and Mr. Caemmerer called on Senator Moses about the matter, who recommended that a protest be filed with the Court of Customs Appeals, asking for a reversal of the decision.

The Commission heard Mr. Lascari's draft of the protest and heartily concurred in the matter. A sketch of the mural paintings was discussed and it was the unanimous opinion that the ruling stands as a great injustice to the art of mural decoration, since among the greatest works of art that exist are mural paintings. It was suggested that the Mural Painters Association also protest formally to the Court of Customs Appeals against the decision.

The Commission were the guests of Mr. Morris at luncheon at the Union League Club, including Col. Grant, Major Gillette, Mr. Nagel, General Matthews, Mr. Walker Hancock, and Mr. Lascari. The Commission adjourned at 4:00 p. m.

COPY

July 31, 1930.

Dear Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on July 23, 1930, considered plans submitted for protection of the machinery of the draw span of the Arlington Memorial Bridge and disapproved the same. The members of the Commission were convinced that the proposed protection would seriously impair the appearance of the bridge. They were also convinced that another solution much less disturbing can be found by the engineers. It seems to the Commission that after the Government has spent so many millions of dollars to construct a beautiful bridge, every precaution should be taken to preserve that beauty.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d,

Executive and Disbursing Officer,

Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission,

Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT A

COPY

August 1, 1930.

Mr. Wm. Mitchell Kendall,
101 Park Avenue,
New York, N. Y.

Subject: Fenders for bascule draw span.

My dear Mr. Kendall:

I am happy to inform you that your recent visit has borne fruit. We have had a long conference with the Office of the Chief of Engineers to discuss ways and means to improve the appearance of the fenders, and the number, type and dimensions of boats using the draw span was gone into very carefully and their needs thoroughly analyzed.

Statistics as to accidents to shipping which have actually occurred on the Potomac River were also analyzed as to cause and means of prevention. It was brought out that there must be a fender of some sort to protect the bridge and to protect navigation and that a row of posts or dolphins would not do. We then requested that we be given the absolute minimum dimensions that such a fender must have in order to fulfill those purposes and we have crystalized these minimum dimensions into a tentative layout which is illustrated on the inclosed print. There are several alternatives as you will note.

A, shows plans and elevation as now is. From a practical standpoint this is the proper type.

B, shows the elevation of what the fender could look like by tapering the wing down to a height of ten feet at the outer end.

C, shows elevation of fender wing if dropped throughout its length to ten feet. It is believed that either B or C would comply with the requirements of navigation.

D and E, show alternative possibilities as to plan view, D having the dolphin separated from the wing and E showing it partially inclosed. Either D or E could be built.

EXHIBIT A-1

I would appreciate it if you would state which of these schemes meets with your approval as it will be absolutely necessary for us to construct something in the very near future in order to protect the draw span. The present work is to be torn out by the Contractor upon the completion of his job at an early date, and we simply can not afford to take chances with this beautiful structure.

I will, therefore, be glad to hold up the award of the contract for the fenders awaiting your reply.

As you will notice in plans D and E the members are merely sketched in and may not be correct from an engineering standpoint. It is not believed that this is a very serious matter because the structure will be so short it will be very difficult to see it from the bridge and you can not see it in plan from the bank.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) U. S. Grant, 3d,
Lieut. Col., Corps of Engineers, U.S.A.
Executive Officer.

DHG:AA

COPY

Kimball, Steele & Sandham

Architects
836 World-Herald Bldg.,
Omaha.

Omaha, Nebr., July 19, 1930.

Roosevelt Memorial Arch:

Mr. E. A. Sherman,
Acting Forester,
Dept. of Agriculture,
930 F Street,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir:-

Since our letter of July 14th to Acting Secretary Dunlap, copy of which was sent to you, we have received a Night Letter, dated July 5th, from Theo. Shoemaker, Acting Regional Forester, Missoula, Montana, a copy of which is herewith enclosed.

Today we have received, also from the Forest Service at Missoula, a duplicate file of Mr. Halm's report with pictures; an express package containing three samples of local stone; and a telegram from Harold Townsend, copy of which is enclosed. This last telegram seems to contradict the information which came with the samples of stone. Copies enclosed.

Our first procedure has been to make an analysis of the suggested design from a cost standpoint. It was evident from the prices quoted in Mr. Shoemaker's night letter that stone dressed and squared for regular courses, would be prohibitive in cost, so we made an estimate using the dimensions given but based on solid random rubble at $35.00 per cu. yd. This produced a figure of $58,135.00. We then refigured this design on a basis of wall construction of same material, walls to be about 2 feet thick. In this we included a reinforced concrete roof slab waterproofed and finished with a course of stone, and two reinforced concrete rib-walls back of arch on interior. We omitted the minor pedestals. The figure arrived at was $34,145.00. In both cases the amounts named did not include anything for carving, bronze work, special scaffolding, etc. Nor do they include architectural services.

It was evident that some drastic simplification must be made if this monument is built within the appropriation. Accordingly we have prepared studies of two different schemes, one retaining the arch motif, and the other showing a gateway, marked by monumental pylons. These are submitted herewith for your consideration.

In laying out the arch we have used the minimum width of twenty-four feet, having in mind the fact that the effect of a monumental arch is always dependent upon a maximum mass of masonry flanking a minimum width of opening. For the construction we are

EXHIBIT B

suggesting reinforced concrete. Sand and gravel according to Mr. Shoemaker may be had for $4.00 per yard. We are locally informed that Portland cement costs about $3.95 at Summit, per barrel. As indicated the concrete would be trimmed integrally with local stone using a coarse ashlar which may be varied in sizes and jointing almost at will. The stone would be eight inches to twelve inches thick except in arch proper where stone of maximum size would be used. The stone would be laid up inside of forms and the concrete poured back of and adjoining same. Surface of the concrete would be untreated; or, as shown, decorated with a forest pattern, a mould for which would be applied to the inner surface of the forms. We believe that this type of arch can be built for about $25,000.00, although this estimate should be checked up locally. This figure does not include any allowance for the architect, for bronze or for sculpture. The form of our design, however, carries three natural locations for sculpture. The two shoulders and the center crown, could well be surmounted by stunning groups, showing the wild life of the locality. It might be that this adornment could be added at some later time.

We are also submitting a further simplification in the form of reinforced concrete pylons, which in natural colors would suggest huge redwood tree-trunks. These trunks would be banded at the base with bronze shields carrying the desired inscriptions, quotations, etc., and would have the titles of the forests, etc. moulded into their surfaces. The surfaces of these two great stumps (fourteen feet to sixteen feet in diameter) would be further given a natural aspect through the use of surface forms taken by gelatin moulds from actual examples of such trees. With the modern use of permanent stains for concrete the effect of two great sequoia stumps can be assured and their interiors can enclose spiral stairways in concrete leading to the flag bases at the top. The dignity of the impression can thus be produced, the permanence of the structure, and the appropriateness of the form, all lead us to feel that this use of concrete is perfectly justifiable for such a monument.

These pylons ought not to cost more than $5000.00 apiece exclusive of bronze, etc.

It will be easy to make prompt delivery of everything required in the way of designs, specifications, etc. for an all concrete monument, and the construction may be carried on in inclement weather by using movable enclosures with salamanders for heat as may be necessary.

We shall await with great interest the result of your consideration of these two sketches, and shall appreciate the fullest and frankest advice on the subject.

Yours truly,

Kimball, Steele & Sandham

(Signed) Wm. L. Steele

COPY

July 28, 1930

Dear Major Stuart:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on July 23, 1930, considered the designs submitted by the Forest Service, which were prepared by Kimball, Steele and Sandham, 836 World-Herald Building, Omaha, Nebraska, for the proposed Theodore Roosevelt Forest Conservation Memorial Arch at Marias Pass of the Continental Divide on the Roosevelt Highway in Summit, Montana. The Commission were very much disappointed in the designs submitted and disapproved them.

The Commission recognized the desire of Hon. Scott Leavitt, House of Representatives, to lay the cornerstone of the Memorial this fall and the Commission concur in this matter. The Commission believed that a very simple treatment can be devised for the location proposed for the memorial but in order to get an idea of the situation, the Commission should have photographs of the locality. Neither of the designs submitted seems to have the required character of simplicity and appropriate use of materials. The Commission would not think of using reinforced concrete in a national memorial.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Respectfully yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Hon. R. Y. Stuart,
Forester, U. S. Forest Service,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT C

COPY

August 2, 1930.

Dear Major Stuart:

The Commission of Fine Arts considered the designs for the Roosevelt Memorial Arch and found them unacceptable. In the letter from the architects, mention is made of using reinforced concrete. This inferior treatment the Commission disapproved. While the Commission are in sympathy with the idea of having a memorial constructed in time for the proposed visit of the President of the United States, they regard it of first importance an adequate memorial be erected as contemplated by Congress even though there be delay in the erection of it. The Commission suggest a cairn of stones be placed at the point to be marked and that this be used for the ceremonial attending the visit of the President.

What the Commission would prefer is two columns of stone cut from the nearest available mountain and a lintel of a similar stone extending from one column to the other. The stone should be as big as the money will allow and should be dressed only sufficiently to allow for the structural necessity. Such a structure would be in keeping with the character of the scenery along the approach of the road and would typify President Roosevelt's connection with the West.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Major R. Y. Stuart, Chief,
Forest Service,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT C-1

COPY

July 25, 1930.

My dear Col. Grant:

Your letter of July 21st, with which you submitted a sketch showing a proposed purchase of a triangle formed by Connecticut Avenue and Calvert Street in Square 2202 for the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway, was carefully considered by the Commission of Fine Arts at the meeting in New York City on July 23, 1930. The Commission concur in your statement that the addition to the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway would protect the approaches to the Connecticut Avenue and Calvert Street bridges and unanimously recommend that it be acquired for the parkway.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Yours very truly,

(Signed) Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d,
Executive and Disbursing Officer,
National Capital Park and Planning Commission,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT D

COPY

LOUIS K. LIGGETT COMPANY

Liggett Building

Forty Second Street at Madison Avenue

New York

July 23, 1930.

RE: 1701-3 Pennsylvania Ave.,
N.W. Cor. 17th Street,
Washington, D. C. (#725)

Gentlemen:

Attention: Mr. Charles Moore, Chairman

Kindly accept our thanks for the kind consideration extended to us by your letter of July 9, 1930 to the Inspector of Buildings in connection with our improvements to the above property. For the Commission's further consideration, we are submitting the following information which we believe will be of assistance in arriving at a decision.

Our lease on the above property is for the short term of ten years and covers only the cellar and first or street floors, excepting the entrance to the upper part of the building. The present occupant of these premises has been in possession for the past thirty years during which time no improvements have been made to the property. Our drawings contemplate the removal of the present obsolete type of wood store front, and the replacement of it by a new front of modern design consisting of French gray marble base, aluminum pilasters, cornices, and glass settings, with walnut entrance doors. Herewith please find photographs which may be of assistance.

We regret that we did not consult the Commission before we started our work. The reason for this was that we did not think that the Commission was interested in projects as small as this. At the time of our survey we knew in general what improvements we contemplated making and accordingly we consulted the District Building Department and we were advised at that time of the major requirements but we were not advised that your Commission would be interested. After our final drawings and specifications were prepared and prior to the award of the contract, the District Building Department was again consulted and we were again advised of certain further requirements which were incorporated in the contract, but again we were not advised that the Commission should be consulted. It was not until our contractor had applied to the Building Department for his permit that we were informed that your approval was necessary for this work. It is the practice in work of this nature to

EXHIBIT E

have the contractor obtain the permit. We had no intention of not complying with your requirements and we did not approach you only because we were unaware of the fact that you were interested in a project of the type that we contemplated. Will you, therefore, please accept our apology for not heretofore approaching you in this matter.

We should appreciate the Commission's prompt consideration and decision on our drawings, because we are obligated to pay rent and have made arrangements to open our store very shortly.

Inasmuch as we are delayed in the prosecution of this work awaiting the Commission's decision, may we not ask the Commission if it cannot approve the drawings in their present state, to give one of its members authority to carry out the Commission's instructions so that we may complete our work at the earliest possible moment. Naturally, we will be glad to compensate the Member of the Commission carrying out such instructions.

I have read with much interest the Eleventh Report of the Commission and I am in sympathy with the objects of it. Accordingly, I have obtained the consent of the executives of the Louis K. Liggett Company to comply with any reasonable suggestions of the Commission insofar as it is physically possible for us to do so, considering the limits of the space under our control.

With many thanks for the Commission's kind consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) W. T. Williams
Walter Thomas Williams
Architect.

The National Commission of Fine Arts,
Washington, D. C.

COPY

July 30, 1930.

Sirs:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on July 23, 1930, at which Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d, Executive Officer of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, was present and participated in the discussion, unanimously resolved:

"That the Commission of Fine Arts would advise the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to refuse permits in all cases involving occupancy of any portion of the public property in the streets for extension of show windows."

The Commission took this action as the result of experience and close observation, for the following reasons:

1. The existing extensions create disorder and so are fundamentally at variance with the considerations that led to the enactment of the Shipstead-Luce Act. A comparison between the Garfinckel Building at 14th and F Streets where no extensions are made in the show windows and the Washington Building at the corner of 15th Street and New York Avenue, illustrate this point. In the Garfinckel Building the show window is an essential feature of the business conducted therein and yet it has been designed to keep such show windows entirely within the limits of the ownership of the property. The Washington Building above the first story is one of the finest commercial buildings in Washington. It is directly opposite the Treasury Department. The architecture of the building on the ground floor is seriously impaired by the show window extensions there permitted. The street is one of banks and hotels all kept within the building lines and the show window extension on the Washington Building creates a disorderly corner.

2. In no other city known to the Commission of Fine Arts are such show window extensions permitted. In New York City a few years ago drastic regulations were made on Fifth Avenue whereby even such ornamental features as the great columns of the Knickerbocker Trust Company and the terrace of the University Club had to be removed although when erected they were permissible under existing regulations.

3. In one of the cases presented to the Commission, that of the Liggett drug store on the corner of 17th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, a building of an old type is to be remodeled and it is proposed to occupy the 17th Street frontage by an extension of show windows into government property. The value of the public land so occupied amounts to many thousands of dollars. Within a short time the street must be widened and all the public space therein must be occupied. Moreover, the government ownership in the opposite square and the strategic position of the square itself in the development of the White House area makes it certain that this entire square will

EXHIBIT E-1

undoubtedly be occupied by a Federal building of the first class. A casual view of the present frontage affords a good contrast between the effect of allowing the extensions and the buildings where no such extensions exist. There are some otherwise good buildings along this side of the street, the architectural appearance of which is ruined by the extension of show windows. There are other buildings where the architectural effect is preserved by the designs of such show windows kept within the building lines.

4. The Commission realize that the effect of a regulation forbidding the further extension of show windows will work a certain amount of hardship and impairment of values but such impairments would be simply the result of the government refusing further to permit the use of public property for private purposes. When it is added that such uses create conditions which the Shipstead-Luce Act was intended to correct, the Commission conceive it to be their first duty to advise the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia against all further permits to use public property.

5. The experience of the Commission of Fine Arts in the matter of the building at the northeast corner of 14th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue is an instance in point. As a result of a stir raised in Congress, the United Cigar Company was induced to submit their plans to the Commission of Fine Arts. As a result, an entirely unobjectionable building was designed, but the disorder created by the extension of show windows on both Pennsylvania Avenue and 14th Street on the first floor and by the signs which obscure the virtues of the architecture on the second floor made the final result most unsatisfactory.

6. For the foregoing reasons, the plans submitted for the alteration of three buildings on Pennsylvania Avenue are returned to the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia with the advice that in each case the extension of show windows asked for be refused and that the fronts of the buildings be redesigned so as to keep the show windows within the building lines of Pennsylvania Avenue. The Commission will be pleased to consider further the plans when so revised.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Board of Commissioners of the
District of Columbia,
District Building,
Washington, D. C.

COPY

July 24, 1930.

Dear General Bash:

The design for the William Rufus King Memorial, which you submitted with your letter of July 15, was brought to the particular attention of Mr. Weinman, sculptor member of the Commission, at their meeting in New York City yesterday. Upon the recommendation of Mr. Weinman, the Commission approved the design, which includes the location proposed for the memorial.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) H. P. Caemmerer
Executive Secretary
and Administrative Officer.

Brigadier General L. H. Bash,
Chief, Construction Division,
Office of the Quartermaster General,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT F

COPY

July 24, 1930.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting in New York City yesterday were much pleased to consider with General Matthews of the Marine Corps and Mr. Walker Hancock, sculptor, the designs which he has submitted for the Marine Corps Expeditionary Medal. The matter was brought to the particular attention of the sculptor member of the Commission, Mr. Weinman. Mr. Weinman has, of course, been greatly interested in this medal since the reverse showing an eagle and anchor, was designed by him for a Navy Department medal some years ago. The Commission gave special consideration to Mr. Hancock's design, showing a Marine in full uniform and in an aggressive attitude. The alternative sketches showed the Marine at post arms, which General Matthews said would not furnish a medal for the Marines which they would be glad to wear. The Marine shown in Mr. Hancock's original sketch is therefore rather to represent a Marine in action responding to the call of duty.

Mr. Hancock has indicated a warship and a transport on each side of the Marine to represent the Navy Department. In view of the fact that the Navy Department is represented by the anchor and eagle of the reverse and as the design of the ships would be so greatly reduced in the finished medal as to appear very faintly, the Commission recommend that the ships be removed from Mr. Hancock's design. Otherwise the Commission approved the design. A print of the design is inclosed.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) H. P. Caemmerer
Executive Secretary
and Administrative Officer.

Brigadier General B. H. Fuller,
Acting Commandant of the Marine Corps,
Navy Building,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT G

COPY

July 25, 1930.

Dear General Harbord:

At the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts in New York City, July 23, 1930, the question of your Second Division Memorial was brought to the attention of the Commission. Mr. Keck submitted an alternative study in the form of a model, showing a figure of Victory, rising from a shaft. Mr. Sanford submitted a design, showing a figure of Victory, standing on a circular pedestal--a memorial room which is "intended to serve as a repository for the safe keeping of the archives of the Division, battle flags, decorations, etc."

In accordance with your wishes as expressed in your letter of July 21st, the Commission took no action in the matter of selecting a sculptor for the memorial. The Commission will be pleased to consider this with your Committee at some convenient time in the near future.

Sincerely yours,

Major General James G. Harbord,
U. S. A., Retired,
Room 1856, 233 Broadway,
New York, N. Y.

Chairman.

EXHIBIT H

COPY

July 31, 1930.

My dear Mr. Daniels:

In further reference to your letter of June 11th, asking for the names of sculptors, from among whom one may be selected to design the statue of the late Governor Aycock, to be placed in Statuary Hall, Mr. A. A. Weinman, the sculptor member of the Commission of Fine Arts, recommends the following sculptors:

Mr. Andrew O'Connor, 17 Rue Compagne Premiere, Paris, France.

Mr. Charles E. Tefft, Guilford, Maine, R. F. D., No. 3.

Mr. Charles Keck, 40 West 10th Street, New York, N. Y.

Mr. Henry Hering, 10 West 33rd Street, New York, N. Y.

Mr. Maxwell Miller, 1335 Greenmount Avenue, Baltimore, Md.

The Commission of Fine Arts concur in Mr. Weinman's recommendation. The Commission is not familiar with the work of F. Wm. Sievers, a sculptor of Richmond, although it is known that he has done work there.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Honorable Josephus Daniels,
Raleigh, North Carolina.

Some day the statues will be removed to a more appropriate and less crowded space. The Congressmen laugh at the forest of bronze and marble.

C. M.

EXHIBIT I

COPY

July 24, 1930.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting in New York City on July 23, 1930, considered plans submitted according to direction by Mr. James Berrall, 615 Colorado Building, of this city, for a maternity ward wing addition to the Freedmen's Hospital at Fourth and Bryant Streets, N. W. The Commission approved the design.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Respectfully,

(Signed) H. P. Caemmerer
Executive Secretary
and Administrative Officer.

The Honorable,

The Secretary of the Interior,

Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT J